

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant :	Samuel J. Shuster et al.	Art Unit :	1635
Serial No. :	10/500,444	Examiner :	Sean McGarry
Filed :	May 18, 2005	Conf. No. :	2312
Title :	METHODS AND MATERIALS FOR MODULATING TASK-3		

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Responsive to the Restriction Requirement mailed September 17, 2007, Applicants elect the invention of Group I, claims 1-13. Applicants further elect the accessible region defined by nucleotides 101 through 156 of SEQ ID NO:2. This lack of unity rejection is traversed.

The U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, acting as the International Search Authority, did not deem the claimed invention to lack unity during the International Phase of the PCT application from which the instant National Phase application claims benefit. According to MPEP §1893.03(d), the same unity of invention practice is applicable in National Phase applications submitted under 35 U.S.C. §371 as that applied to international applications.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that further restriction of Group I is improper. The antisense oligonucleotides encompassed by the claims and delineated by their ability to hybridize to one of the indicated accessible regions comply with the guidelines set forth in the PCT Administrative Instructions at Annex B, Section (f). Contrary to the Examiner's assertion that each antisense sequence behaves in a different way, the claimed oligonucleotides meet the criteria of (A) because all alternatives (i.e., each antisense molecule that hybridizes to an accessible region) not only have a common activity (i.e., inhibiting the production of TASK-3), they also have the common property of binding to regions of a common sequence (human TASK-3; SEQ ID NO:2). Also contrary to the Examiner's assertion that the claimed antisense oligonucleotides do not comply with the requirements of unity of invention, the instant oligonucleotides do meet the criteria of (B)(2) because all alternatives belong to the same art

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EFS-WEB FILING

I hereby certify that this paper was filed with the Patent and Trademark Office using the EFS-WEB system on this date: February 19, 2008

Applicant : Samuel J. Shuster et al.
Serial No. : 10/500,444
Filed : May 18, 2005
Page : 2 of 2

Attorney's Docket No.: 14848-004US1

recognized class of compounds (i.e., antisense oligonucleotides), and each member could be substituted one for the other with the expectation that the same intended result would be achieved (i.e., inhibiting the production of TASK-3). Thus, according to the guidelines set forth in Section (f)(i)(a) of Annex B of the PCT Administrative Instructions, the special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2 has been met.

Applicants submit that the further restriction of the claims of Group I is improper, and respectfully request that the further restriction of Group I be withdrawn and the TASK-3 nucleic acid sequence be examined with respect to all of the recited accessible regions.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

/February 19, 2008/

/M. Angela Parsons/

Date: _____

M. Angela Parsons, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 44,282

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696